REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

No claims are currently being cancelled.

Claims 1, 35 and 48 are currently being amended.

No claims are currently being added.

This amendment amends claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-60 remain pending in this application.

Request for Entry of After-Final Amendment and Reply:

It is respectfully requested that this after-final Amendment and Reply be considered and entered, since: a) it adds features to independent claims 1, 35 and 48 that were already included in independent claim 18, and thus no new issues are raised by these amendments, and b) it is believed to lessen the number of potential issues for appeal.

Claim Rejections – Prior Art:

In the Office Action, claims 1-4, 7-9, 12-16, 18-21, 24-26, 29-33, 35-38, 41-43, 45-46, 48-51, 54-56 and 58-59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,587,125 to Paroz et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,857,102 to Bickmore et al. and U.S. Patent No. 6,710,790 to Fagioli; claims 5, 17, 22, 34, 39, 47, 52 and 60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paroz et a., Bickmore et al., Fagioli, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,610,105 to Martin, Jr; claims 6, 23, 40 and 53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paroz et a., Bickmore et al., Fagioli, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,288,715 to Bain et al.; and claims 10-11, 27-28, 44 and 57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paroz

et a., Bickmore et al., Fagioli, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,263,363 to Rosenblatt et al. These rejections are traversed for at least the reasons given below.

The Office Action correctly recognizes that Paroz does not expressly teach that the screen information transmission means transmits only the data of the active window and the objects displayed therein. However, the Office Action incorrectly asserts that Bickmore teaches these features.

Bickmore is directed to a method and system for providing device-independent access to the World Wide Web, whereby web page filtering lets a user see only those portions of a web page that the user is interested in. See column 3, lines 20-22 of Bickmore. However, unlike the presently claimed invention, the filtering in Bickmore is performed by either an intermediate server or by the client device, whereby neither of these corresponds to the device to be operated. See, for example, column 9, lines 55-60 of Bickmore, whereby the client refers to the device that is not capable of displaying the image, and as such the image is reduced in size to be thereby displayed by the client (e.g., a cellular phone).

Since Fagioli does not rectify the above-mentioned shortcomings of Bickmore, each of the presently pending independent claims 1, 18, 35 and 48 is patentable over the combined teachings of these three references.

The presently pending dependent claims under rejection are patentable due to the specific features recited in those claims, as well as for they dependence on one of the independent claims discussed above.

For example, claims 6, 23, 40 and 53 each recites that the screen change detection means determines that the change that occurred in the display of the screen is completed when no screen change is detected in the display of the screen for more than a predetermined time period. The Office Action asserts that Bain's teaching of a screen saver that turns on after a period of inactivity is detected, corresponds to the features recited in this claim. Applicant respectfully disagrees. While a screen saver is provided to detect inactivity within a predetermined time period, this does not correspond to determining that a change that occurred in the display of a screen is completed when no screen change is detected in the display of the screen for more than a predetermined period of time. Rather, the screen saver

of Bain will detect inactivity within a predetermined time period, which will automatically activate a screen saver display, while claim 6 is directed to detecting that a change that occurred in a display of a screen is completed. In other words, Bain's screen saver may incorrectly detect completion of a screen change whenever no activity is detected, which is not what is recited in claims 6, 23, 40 and 53.

Accordingly, claims 6, 23, 40 and 53 are patentable for these additional reasons.

With respect to dependent claims 7-9, the Office Action relies on Paroz for allegedly teaching the features recited in these claims. In particular, for claim 7, the Office Action asserts that the glossary provided in column 6 of Paroz, as well as Figure 5 of Paroz, teaches the features recited in this claim. However, this assertion is incorrect. There is no teaching or suggestion in Paroz, or in any of the other cited art of record, of providing GUI widget information along with the x,y,z coordinate position data of an active window.

Accordingly, claims 7-9 are patentable for these additional reasons.

With respect to dependent claims 15 and 16, the Office Action relies on Paroz for allegedly teachings the features recited in these claims. However, in its analysis of claim 15, the Office Action ignores the features added to that claim in the previously-filed reply, in which the screen analysis means does not perform any picture data extraction when moving picture or still picture is not displayed on the screen of said device to be operated. Accordingly, since the Office Action has not made a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to all of the features recited in claims 15 and 16, these claims are patentable for these additional reasons.

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date April 11, 2006 By Phillip J. Articola

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5407
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

David A. Blumenthal
Registration No. 26,257

Phillip J. Articola
Registration No. 38,819